

## **REMARKS**

Claim 14 is objected to for informalities. Claims 7-9 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. Claims 1-4, 10-19, 21, 24, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 7,044,614 B2 to Levy (hereinafter “Levy”). Claims 6 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy. Claims 5 and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy in view of United States Patent Number 6,069,441 to Lengyel (hereinafter “Lengyel”).

For the Examiner’s convenience and reference, Applicants’ remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 10, 14, 15, 18, 24, and 29 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Claims 5-9, 11, 13, 22, 23, and 25 are canceled. Applicants have also added new claims 31-35. Claim 12 is amended to depend from a pending claim.

The amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification. Specifically, claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are amended with the limitation that the compound is applied to the control object “to form a designator upon the control object, wherein the designator distinctly

identifies the control object...” Claim 1 as amended. See also claims 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 as amended. The amendment is well supported by the specification, which discloses forming the designator and the designator distinctly identifying the control object. ¶ 18, lines 5-6; ¶ 2, lines 5-6.

Applicants have also amended claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 with the limitation that the compound reacts to visible and non-visible light by radiating visible light. Claims 4 and 18 are amended to specify that the compound comprises an “ultraviolet light reactive compound.” Claim 4 as amended. See also claim 18 as amended. The amendments are supported by the specification, which discloses a visible ink. ¶ 38, lines 5-6.

Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are further amended with the limitation “...the compound radiates visible light in the form of the designator and the visible light is of low intensity so as not to distract a user and nearby people...” Claim 1 as amended. See also claims 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 as amended. The amendment is supported by the specification, which discloses the designator and the low intensity visible light. ¶ 38, lines 4-6; ¶ 39, lines 4-5. Claims 24 and 29 are also amended to remove the phrase “...activating the compound by...” to conform to the specification. ¶ 50, lines 6-7; Fig. 10, ref. 1015.

Applicants have amended claim 14 to claim a notebook computer with keys, wherein the compound is applied to the keys. The amendment is well supported by the specification, which discloses the notebook computer as one embodiment of the present invention. Fig. 6, ref. 600; Fig. 7, ref. 700.

New claims 31, 32, 34, and 35 include the limitation of a positioning stalk. The

limitation is in original claim 20 and in the specification. Fig. 7, ref. 210. New claim 33 is also disclosed by the specification, which teaches the non-visible light source disposed on the display. ¶ 42, lines 2-3, Fig. 6, ref. 510.

Response to objections to claims for informalities.

Claim 14 is objected to for informalities. Applicants have amended claim 14 as suggested to cure the informality.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph.

Claims 7-9 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Claims 7-9 and 25 are canceled. However, claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are amended with the limitations of claims 7 and 25. Therefore, claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are amended to specify that the compound forms the same designator under visible and non-visible lighting. Applicants submit that the amendments cure the indefiniteness.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1-4, 10-19, 21, 24, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Levy. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 include the limitation that the compound forms a *designator on the control object that distinctly identifies the control object*. Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29. The compound reacts to visible and non-visible light and when directly

radiated with non-visible light, the “...compound *radiates visible light in the form of the designator and the visible light is of low intensity so as not to distract a user and nearby people.*”

Claim 1 as amended, emphasis added. See also claims 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 as amended.

In contrast, Levy also discloses applying a photochromic compound to keys and/or keypads. Levy, col. 2, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 34-36. Illuminating the photochromic compound on the keys changes the appearance of the product, including the keys. Levy, Abstract. In addition, Levy teaches that keys may display different function designations when illuminated with ultraviolet light than when illuminated with visible light. Levy, col. 5, line 62 – col. 6, line 10.

The present invention is distinguished from Levy in that the compound of the present invention radiates visible light in response to both visible and non-visible light, so that the same designator is visible in both normal-light environments and in low-light environments when the non-visible light source directly radiates the designator. In contrast with Levy, the non-visible light source of the present invention does not change the appearance of a product or a function designation. Levy also does not teach that the visible light radiated in response to the non-visible light *is of low intensity so as not to distract a user and nearby people.*

Because Levy does not teach each of the elements of the claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29, Applicants submit that claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are allowable. Claims 11 and 13 are canceled. Applicants have not traversed the rejections of dependent claims 2-4, 12, 16-19, 21, and 26-28, and 30, but submit that these claims are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy. Claims 5 and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy in view of Lengyel. Claims 5, 6, 22, and 23 are canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 20, as well as applying the Examiner's arguments to new claims 31, 32, 34, and 35.

Claims 20, 31, 32, 34, and 35 include the limitation of the "...non-visible light source is disposed upon a positioning stalk." Claim 20. See also claims 31, 32, 34, and 35. In contrast, Levy teaches piping ultraviolet energy through a housing lightpipe, but does not teach piping the ultraviolet energy from the housing. Levy, col. 4, lines 19-23. Levy also discloses discrete external sources. Levy, col. 3, lines 3-8.

However, Levy does not teach a non-visible light source disposed upon a positioning stalk. Applicants further respectfully disagree that it is obvious to provide a UV light source in a stalk-like connection in physical communication with the I/O device as there is no teaching of a stalk-like connection in Levy. Levy teaches away from the concept of a stalk-like connection in physical communication with the I/O device by disclosing using internal UV sources so that external sources do not affect the appearance of the device. Levy, col. 5, lines 48-61. Because Levy does not teach the element of the non-visible light source is disposed upon a positioning stalk, Applicants submit that claim 20, and claims 31, 32, 34, and 35 are allowable.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14-21, 24, and 26-35 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required

regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 3, 2006  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 322-1054